REMARKS

Claims 1-24 were pending in the application. The non-final office action, dated December 3, 2010, rejects all pending claims 1-24.

This paper amends claim 21 in accordance with the recommendation of the office action. Applicant is not conceding that the subject matter encompassed by claim 21 prior to this Amendment is not patentable. Claim 21 was amended in this paper solely to facilitate expeditious prosecution of the application. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to pursue claims, including the subject matter encompassed by claim 21 as presented prior to this Amendment and additional claims in one or more continuing applications.

Claims 1-24 remain pending in the application.

Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101

The Office Action rejects Claims 21-24 under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant has amended claims 21-24 to be directed to a computer program product comprising a non-transitory computer readable storage medium, as suggested by the office action. Thus, the applicant respectfully submits that the amendment overcomes the rejection.

Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-14 and 16-24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dalal et al. (U.S. Application Publication No. 2003/0014488) in view of von Kaenel (US Publication No. 2004/0117358) and further in view of Blevins (U.S. Patent No. 7,627,631). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent claim 1 recites, in pertinent part, integrating a third-party system with an online meeting system. A service provider interface (SPI) is provided. The SPI defines a plurality of procedures for communicating with a meeting services application of the online meeting system. One of the procedures of the SPI is implemented in a third-party software module of the third-party system. The third-party software module is installed as a plug-in to the meeting services application. A call to the implemented SPI procedure of the installed third-

party software module is received from the meeting services application, to perform the meeting-related operation.

The primary reference, Dalal, teaches a conferencing system that has client-side components and server-side components. On the server side, a conference service provider controls server components referred to as SPCC (Service Provider Conference Controller) and SPMS (Service Provider Media Server). The SPCC is mainly responsible for performing administrative tasks related to conference management, and the SPMS is mainly responsible for handling communications payloads for ongoing conferences. Each conference is associated with an SPMS, and each conference participant establishes a real-time session with the SPMS. The conference participants send their media payloads to the SPMS, which then routes them to the rest of the participants. The SPMS may also "mix" received media streams before sending them to the conference participants.

On the client side of Dalal's conferencing system are the CLIENT CONFERENCE CONTROLLER (CCC) and CLIENT SESSION CONTROLLER (CSC) components. Along with SPCC, the CCC is responsible for performing administrative tasks related to conference management. The CCC (client side) sends requests to the SPCC (server side) in order to CREATE and DELETE conferences and to INVITE participants to a conference. The CSC is the client-side component that is directly built on the real-time communications services of the underlying RTC platform. Specifically, CSC establishes a real-time session using the API provided by the RTC platform in order to connect to the conference SPMS (Paragraph [0025]).

Presumably, the Office Action is equating Dalal's CREATE, DELETE, and INVITE requests to the applicant's claimed procedures for communicating with a meeting services application and considers these requests to constitute a service provider interface. In addition, the Office Action argues that Dalal teaches implementing (one of) the procedures in a software module. Applicant makes no comment as to the validity of this characterization.

Notwithstanding, the Office Action acknowledges that "Dalal does not specifically teach that the software module is a third party software module of a third-party system, the third-party

software module perform[sic] a meeting related operation customized in accordance with the third-party system; and integrating the meeting-related operation, customized in accordance with the third-party system, into the online meeting system." To this, the applicant adds that Dalal does not teach or suggest "installing the third party software module as a plug-in to the meeting services application," as set forth in the applicant's claims.

For the teaching of a third-party software module of a third-party system, the office action relies on von Kaenel, referring to paragraph [0265], which states, in pertinent part:

> Enterprise integration 740 allows users to access securely their enterprise data that is stored outside of the data center 720. ...
> The enterprise integration technology 740 also provides the ability to interact with and retrieve data from third party applications using various Application Programming Interfaces (API) exposed by the third party applications and makes the data available to the client systems of the data center 720. The enterprise integration technology 740 also provides various Application Programming Interfaces (API) to third party applications so that different third party applications, including enterprise applications, can access production data from the data center 720. The APIs provide defined function calls to third party applications so that users can interact with the enterprise spatial system provided by implementations of the invention to utilize stored data (e.g., raster data, vector data, and tabular data) for spatially analyzing enterprise data. In addition to accessing data, the APIs also allow third party applications to utilize the various analysis functions provided by the enterprise spatial system.

Hence, von Kaenel may be seen to teach the use of APIs that enable third-party applications to interact with the enterprise system for purposes of accessing data and utilizing analysis functions provided by the enterprise system. Based on this teaching, the Office Action suggests modifying Dalal so that Dalal's CREATE, DELETE, and INVITE "procedures" are implemented as third-party software modules. Applicant respectfully submits that there is no reasonable basis for making such a modification.

For one, Dalal does not teach or suggest that the current CREATE, DELETE, and INVITE "procedures" are inadequate, broken, or that the conferencing system can be improved

upon by converting the CREATE, DELETE, and INVITE "procedures" into third-party software modules. Dalal's conferencing system simply has no need for any alternative implementation of the CREATE, DELETE, and INVITE "procedures", let alone to implement them as third-party software modules.

In addition, von Kaenel does not teach or suggest that converting conferencing services into third-party software modules will provide any improvement. In actuality, CREATE, DELETE, and INVITE "procedures" are core to a conferencing system; without such procedures, the conferencing system cannot function; and to modify Dalal's conferencing system to implement these essential procedures as third-party software modules effectively places the essence of the conferencing system into someone else's hands, namely the third party. The conferencing becomes entirely defunct if no third party chooses to implement, for example, the CREATE procedure. Hence, any suggestion to change Dalal to use third-party software modules as an alternative mechanism for providing conferencing services cannot come from Dalal or von Kaenel.

Notwithstanding, the Office Action says that such a modification would be an improvement by enabling delegations of services to third party applications and enabling third party services to accomplish necessary or help tasks. Applicant respectfully submits, however, that this statement, aside from being conclusory and unsubstantiated, may even be wholly untrue, such as, for example, would be the case where no third party produces an essential procedure, or, rather, produces one of poor quality, or, perhaps, if multiple third parties produce competing CREATE procedures (which one does the conferencing system use?). In such instances, "enabling third party services to accomplish necessary ... tasks", as proffered by the Office Action, can be quite detrimental to the successful operation of Dalal's conferencing system.

Furthermore, the proposed modification of Dalal to implement the CREATE, DELETE, and INVITE services as third-party software modules changes Dalal's fundamental principle of operation. Dalal does not use or contemplate the use of third-party software modules to provide its core conferencing services. The proposed modification would require Dalal to effectively "outsource" the core procedures of its conferencing services to third-party applications, which is

a fundamental alteration in Dalal's principle of operation. Consequently, because one presented with Dalal and von Kaenel would not think to make such a modification, the applicant's invention cannot be obvious in light of these references.

Blevins describes a plug-in framework by which third-party developers can extend the functionality of an integration system. But like von Kaenel, Blevins does not teach or suggest the desirability of converting Dalal's conferencing services into third-party software modules, as plug-ins or otherwise. As previously argued in connection with von Kaenel, such a modification is non-obvious because Dalal's conferencing system has no need for any alternative (third-party plug-in) implementation of the CREATE, DELETE, and INVITE "procedures", it is not established, contrary to the Office Action's assertion, that such an implementation would improve Dalal, and such an alternative implementation would alter Dalal's fundamental principle of operation. Applicant therefore submits that the claims are non-obvious over the cited references, and respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Each of the other independent claims 11, 17 and 21 recite claim language similar to that of independent claim 1 and is patentable for at least those reasons provided in connection with claim 1. Dependent claims 3, 5, 6, 8-10, 12-14, 16-20, and 21-24 depend directly or indirectly from one of the independent claims, and are patentable for at least those reasons presented above in connection with the particular independent claim from which each depends. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejection against these claims also be withdrawn.

The Office Action also rejects claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dalal in view of von Kaenel, Blevins, and Krishnaswamy et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,909,708), and claims 7 and 15 over Dalal in view of von Kaenel, Blevins, and Nakajima (U.S. Patent No. 6,289,510). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections because each of the claims 4, 7, and 15 depends from an allowable independent claim, and is patentable for at least this reason.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits that this paper provides a response for all pending claims. Any absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue, or comment, or to any taking of "official

notice" or reliance on "common sense", however, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue, comment, taking of "official notice", or reliance on "common sense". In addition, because the arguments made above are not exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims before and after any amendment thereof that have not been expressed.

In view of the amendments and arguments made herein, applicant submits that the application is in condition for allowance and requests early favorable action by the Examiner.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone conversation with the applicant's representative would expedite allowance of this application, the Examiner is cordially invited to call the undersigned at (508) 303-0932.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 4, 2011
Reg. No. 41,274

Fax No.: (508) 303-0005
Tel. No.: (508) 303-0932

/Michael A. Rodriguez/
Michael A. Rodriguez
Attorney for applicant
Guerin & Rodriguez, LLP
5 Mount Royal Avenue
Marlborough, MA 01752